

## REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-4 and 6-9 will be pending in this application. Applicant has canceled claim 5 and added claims 6-9 above.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected by the Office under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of French. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of French and Kimura. Applicant asks the Office to reconsider this application and allow all of the claims.

### Amended Claim 1

French does not show, nor does he suggest, a hardware cabinet having a plenum formed between the cabinet door and electronic systems mounted in the cabinet, “where the distance by which the plenum separates the solid face of the door from the electronic systems . . . is maximized to promote air flow through the plenum while keeping the electronic systems within an acceptable range of access when a human user must enter the cabinet,” as claimed. French could not possibly show a plenum that maximizes separation in this manner, because French makes it clear the “chimney” in his cabinet causes the very problem that he is trying to correct. In particular, French states that, because “the chimney 18 is a very low impedance path, . . . the flow of air does not optimally cool the electronic components stored within” the cabinet. (Col. 2, lines 25-30.)

French’s solution to this problem is to interrupt the air flow through the chimney with one or more “air dams 48,” so that air does not flow as easily through the chimney. Applicant, on the other hand, is claiming a cabinet with a plenum whose width is selected to maximize air flow through the plenum. French would have no desire to maximize airflow in the chimney, and he certainly does not suggest, let alone teach, selecting the size of the chimney to do so. The result is that claim 1 and the claims that depend from it all are patentable over French.

### Claims 3-4 and 6-9

Applicant points out that, while the Office has included claims 3 and 4 in the 102(b) rejection, it has failed to point to any specific portion of the French reference that shows or even suggests the elements added in these claims. In particular, the Office does not explain in its action where one might find an opening formed in French’s chassis itself, as opposed to the

opening formed in the door (claim 3), nor does Applicant find any suggestion of such an opening. Likewise, because no such opening in the chassis exists, Applicant finds no teaching in French to position such an opening near the opening in the door (claim 4). The result is that these claims are patentable over French for reasons even beyond those given in connection with claim 1 above.

As for claims 6-9, all of these claims require “a first opening” formed in the door and “a second opening” formed in the chassis as well. Therefore, these claims also are patentable over French.

Kimura

Like French, Kimura does not show or suggest a cabinet in which “the distance by which the plenum separates the solid face of the door from the electronic systems . . . is maximized to promote air flow through the plenum while keeping the electronic systems within an acceptable range of access when a human user must enter the cabinet.” Kimura also does not show or suggest a first opening formed in the door of the cabinet and a second opening formed in the cabinet chassis. Accordingly, all of the claims are patentable over the combination of French and Kimura.

## CONCLUSIONS

All of the claims remaining in this application are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore asks the Office to withdraw the rejections and allow all of the claims. Please apply any charges that might be due, excepting the issue fee but including fees for extensions of time, to deposit account 14-0225.

Respectfully,



John D. Cowart  
Reg. No. 38,415

NCR Corporation  
1700 South Patterson Blvd.  
Dayton, Ohio 45479-0001

Tel. No. (858) 485-4903  
Fax No. (858) 485-3255